SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A. 8425 SEASONS PARKWAY, SUITE 105

ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA 55125

TEL 651.735-1100 FAX 651.735-1102 WWW.SSIPLAW.COM RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER MAR 0 9 2005

TO: Examiner Peter J. Smith	FROM: Kelly Patrick Fitzgerald
COMPANY: USPTO	DATE: MARCH 9, 2005
FAX NUMBER: 703-872-9306	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVERS
PHONE NUMBER: 571-272-4101	SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER. 1037-008US01
RE: Interview Summary	application serial number: 09/534,824

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 0 9 2005

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants:

Christopher J. Edge;

Confirmation No.

9982

Timothy A. Fischer; William A. Rozzi

AA 1111

Customer No.:

28863

Serial No.: Filed:

March 23, 2000

09/534,824

Examiner:

Peter J. Smith

Group Art Unit:

2176

Docket No.:

1037-008US01

Title:

MODIFICATION OF COLOR VALUES IN PAGE DESCRIPTION FILES

AMENDMENT

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicants thank Examiner Peter Smith and supervising Examiner Sanjiv Shah for conducting the personal Examiner Interview of March 1, 2005. Examiners Peter Smith and Sanjiv Shah, and Applicant's representative Kelly Patrick Fitzgerald (Reg. No. 46,326) were involved in the Examiner Interview, in person, at the United States Patent and Trademark Office. Mr. Smith, Mr. Shah and Mr. Fitzgerald discussed the pending claims and specifically discussed independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2, 6 and 7. The prior art reference Marimont (US 5,835,099) was also discussed.

Applicant's representative generally explained the features of claim 1 that require the identification of implicit color commands and conversion of the implicit color commands specifically within the page description file.

Examiner Sanjiv Shah indicated that the terms implicit and explicit were not being given patentable weight by the Examiners. Applicant's representative disputed this point and noted that the previous three Office Actions had addressed these terms and had given these terms consideration. Applicant's representative also questioned why this point had not been raised in

Application No. 09/534,824 Interview Summary in relation to Examiner Interview of March 1, 2005

the previous three Office Actions. Nevertheless, Applicant's representative acknowledged Mr. Shah's point, with traverse.

In relation to the discussion of the phrases "implicit color commands" and "explicit color commands," Mr. Shah indicated that these phrases might be better defined to advance the case toward issuance. Mr. Shah noted that dependent claims 6 and 7 provide better definitions of these phrases, and specifically indicated that the combination of features recited in claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 would likely be given favorable consideration by the Examiners. Applicant's representative thanked Examiner Shah for these remarks.

Applicant's representative further stressed that the applied prior art did not perform a replacement of any commands within a page description file. The Examiners noted this distinction, and agreed to give this difference between the pending claims and the prior art further consideration.

Finally, Applicant's representative questioned how the admitted prior art relating to raster image processing could be used to reject claims, such as claim 2, that specifically preclude raster image processing. Applicant's representative noted that a formal reply had been filed on Feb. 7, 2005. The Examiners agreed to give the current claims further consideration in view of the Examiner Interview and the arguments presented in the formal reply filed on Feb. 7, 2005.

No formal agreement was reached regarding the allowability of claims.

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number 50-1778. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney to discuss this application.

Date:

SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.

8425 Seasons Parkway, Suite 105 St. Paul, Minnesota 55125

Telephone: 651.735.1100 Facsimile: 651.735.1102 By:

Name: Kelly Patrick Fit